

# NEW YORK JOURNAL AND ADVERTISER

W. R. HEARST.

AN AMERICAN PAPER FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

## AN AMERICAN INTERNAL POLICY.

### FIRST—PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC FRANCHISES.

The Values Created by the Community Should Belong to the Community.

### SECOND—DESTRUCTION OF CRIMINAL TRUSTS.

No Monopolization of the National Resources by Lawless Private Combinations More Powerful Than the People's Government.

### THIRD—A GRADUATED INCOME TAX.

Every Citizen to Contribute to the Support of the Government According to His Means, and Not According to His Necessities.

### FOURTH—ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.

The Senate, Now Becoming the Private Property of Corporations and Bosses, to Be Made Truly Representative, and the State Legislatures to Be Redeemed from Recurring Scandals.

### FIFTH—NATIONAL, STATE AND MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.

As the Duties of Citizenship Are Both General and Local, Every Government, General and Local, Should Do Its Share Toward Fitting Every Individual to Perform Them.

### SIXTH—CURRENCY REFORM.

All the Nation's Money to Be Issued by the Nation's Government, and Its Supply to Be Regulated by the People and Not by the Banks.

### SEVENTH—NO PROTECTION FOR OPPRESSIVE TRUSTS.

Organizations Powerful Enough to Oppress the People Are No Longer "Infant Industries."

### HANNA SAYS TRUSTS NOT AN ISSUE.

This would seem to indicate that the Republican leader expects in some way to keep the trusts out of the campaign entirely, or so to juggle with them under colored lights that they will appear attractive to those who do not inquire deeply into the subject.

Without deferring in any way to Senator Hanna and his party, the trusts are intruding themselves, of their own growth and momentum, more prominently into national politics every day.

In the State of New Jersey during the fiscal year which ended last week one hundred charters were granted to absolute trusts, not including many "mushroom" concerns of the nature of the Ramapo Water Company.

Under the liberal laws of New Jersey alone fifteen thousand trusts and corporations are operating in every section of America. Many hundreds of this number have been organized to corner and control certain products.

Outside of New Jersey there have been more trusts chartered this year than ever before in the history of any country in the world.

When all these trusts are in full swing, with all the power of their billions of dollars of capitalization; when all food products are cornered, when all materials for wearing apparel and for personal comfort are sold or withheld from market as the combinations may dictate, will Senator Hanna still say that trusts are not a vital issue?

To all trusts in general the Railroad Trust in particular will extend, as in the past, the hand of good-fellowship in the way of rebates on all shipments made by them, and a killing freight for those who are outside the general combination.

Armour will receive rebates on his beef, Morgan on his coal, Havemeyer on his sugar and Rockefeller on his oil, while the dealer outside the trusts must ship at higher prices, without rebate and without favor.

The extent of these discriminations may be imagined when it is stated that in sixteen months the rebate given the Standard Oil Company amounted to \$11,000,000.

If trusts are not a vital issue in the campaign there is nothing vital in this country.

### OF COURSE IT WAS GOOD.

Minneapolis:

As a terse, comprehensive and convincing review of American expansion punctuating a century of national life, and of the vain and short-sighted opposition thereto, this Minneapolis speech was a gem. In the vernacular of the curb, it was a "daisy." It might even, on a pinch of propriety, be designated as "billy." Above all, it was American, with a large "A." It must cause a cold chill to race up and down every Atkinsonian spine in this happy land.

Of course. How could the President's speech fail to deserve all these compliments when it was taken in its whole structure, and word for word in some of its material, and the editorial columns of the Journal?

### FAILURE TO GLORIFY SAMPSON.

In the face of public protests it has dared openly to disparage the hero of Santiago, but it neglects no opportunity to exalt Sampson and to put forth sneaking innuendoes against Schley whenever possible.

The latest mouthpiece of the fanatical cabal is no less a person than John D. Long, Secretary of the Navy. In a speech at Minneapolis he grasped an opportunity for the glorification of the department's pet as follows:

"I recall the fall of Santiago before the guns of Sampson."

The Honorable Secretary got no further. The crowd uttered in a mighty cry of "Schley! Schley! Schley!"

Will not the Navy Department learn in time that the public will not brook misrepresentation or countenance misplaced laurels in the matter of Schley and Sampson?

The people may sometimes go blind in one eye on a given subject, but they seldom lose their sense of justice along with it.

Administration organs may print their diatribes with arrows and stars that show nothing, and the naval clique may seat Sampson on an Olympian cloud of glory, but

### THE CAUSE AND THE FIGHT.

The Journal's views on the Boer war have elicited showers of letters, some of which are printed on this page. Most of our correspondents approve the Journal's position, although some do not.

On the merits of the quarrel Americans who are not blinded by prejudice can see that the Boers deserve to lose. A little oligarchy that tries to maintain an oppressive rule over a majority is fighting the spirit of the age. Religious proscription is a hundred years behind the times. But regardless of the rights and wrongs of the controversy, nobody can help admiring the splendid courage with which the little Dutch republics have defied an empire that France and Russia have not ventured to attack. They are not playing a game of war in which they occupy reserved seats while their armies and navies fight distant battles for their entertainment—they are staking their national existence against desperate odds, calling their entire manhood to the field and throwing open their homes to invasion. May their brave hearts win them magnanimous treatment when the end comes!

### SECRETARY ROOT AND THE CUBAN CABLE.

It has not taken Secretary Root long to adjust to his political back to the notorious harness of Alger.

By his order American troops will continue to prevent the landing of another American cable in Cuba. This newspaper has already pointed out the rank injustice of upholding a monopoly by force of arms where there is absolutely no legal cause for interference. The decision of the Secretary of War furnishes another text upon the matter.

The excuse given by the Secretary of War that the forty-year charter granted to the Western Union Telegraph in 1866 by Spain is still valid offers but a flimsy pretext for forcible interference.

If Spanish laws and charters in the island of Cuba are to be upheld, by what process of reasoning did this Government abrogate the old Spanish monopolistic grant of 50 cents for the cartage of every head of cattle that is slaughtered in Havana?

Why? Simply because that grant interfered with the profits of another American monopoly—the monopoly of Armour.

How does this Government presume to make fish of one Spanish grant and fowl of another?

Secretary Root is becoming acquainted with his Administration primer.

### PLATT'S SCHEME OF CHARTER REVISION.

It being his turn to play in the political game now raging, Senator Platt proposes to put forth a card which has been concealed up his sleeve for some time.

It is nothing less than a partisan revision of the city charter, by which it is proposed to legislate the Democrats out of power to the end that Platt himself shall take charge of everything in sight.

The plot is worthy of this old political badger. During his entire career he has clung to the neck of this city, choking it, hampering it, riding it like an old man of the sea, and shaking it down now and then for the benefit of the up-State Republican majority.

As the charter stands, Platt's friends were its principal constructors, and Platt's friends inserted the Ramapo clause, calculated to enable other of Platt's friends to steal \$200,000,000 from the city treasury.

But Platt is not satisfied with it. If he gets it changed to his liking, in the words of the old almanac, "look out for high crime and the spollation of the city treasury."

### WOMAN'S EMANCIPATION PROGRESSING.

This worries some people. They seem to be afraid that women will become masculine, while men will lose their whiskers and begin to sing soprano.

These things will not happen, but something very surprising may. We shall be apt to learn something which only a few people know now—and that is that women have never believed

talked of "masculine" work and "feminine" work. We were in the habit of seeing men do certain things and women certain other things. We thought they were obeying a law of nature and no other division of labor was possible.

In the last thirty years we have learned that much work which we supposed to be masculine or feminine was nothing of the kind. It was simply plain work—human work, with no sex at all.

We have women doctors, lawyers, dentists, professors, journalists, preachers and architects.

On the other side, we have men milliners, dressmakers, nurses and laundresses. Now we are to have the man for general housework.

His success in this line will be the best thing for woman that has ever yet occurred.

### CONDENSED EDITORIALS.

VARIOUS HIGH-MINDED SENATORS are advocating the appointment of a "trust examiner" to watch monopolies. Who will watch the examiner?

ROCKEFELLER AND CARNEGIE have fought a great monopoly battle on the lakes. At last accounts Rockefeller had Carnegie against the ropes and was trying to force him to pay trust freights.

ENGLAND HAS BOUGHT 100,000 Missouri chickens for use in the Transvaal. Will this make Tommy Atkins chicken-hearted?

FROM THE TRANSVAAL comes the awful news that the world's supply of diamonds has been cut off and that their price has increased 50 per cent. This will doubtless cause great distress among those who are in the habit of having diamonds for breakfast.

IN ANOTHER COLUMN we print a letter from a committee of citizens at Blissville, complaining of the closing of the bridge over Newtown Creek and the establishment of an arbitrary ferry toll at that place. This is a matter that should be investigated by the city authorities. The contract for the Blissville bridge has apparently been violated, and if so the people there have a genuine grievance.

### Mr. Cockran Explains.

Editor of the New York Journal: The statement attributed to me in some reports of my speech in Congress last concerning the political status of Catholics in England is so patently absurd that until it had been made the subject of comment I never supposed anybody could be misled by it, or would consider it other than the result of a stenographic error.

As I have the honor of numbering among my own friends several Catholics who hold office under the English Crown, I beg that you will publish my exact words.

While discussing England's right of intervention under international law as distinguished from her rights under the convention of '84, I referred to the widely excluded class of the Catholics and Jews were excluded from office by the laws of the Transvaal, and said: "If this be true it shows that these laws are bigoted and illiberal, but not that they are inadequate to the protection of life and property. Religious disabilities are deplorable survivals of the days when politics and religion were inextricably confounded. They exist in almost every country of the Old World. In England to this day Catholics cannot hold certain offices."

To guard against any possibility of self-deception I have consulted the officers of the meeting and find that their recollections agree with mine. If my views are accurately stated, it is well that they be accurately stated.

I may add that any other published statement on this subject attributed to me is unauthorized and unfounded.

W. BOURKE COCKRAN.

New York, Oct. 13, 1899.

### A Sailing Master's Comments on Columbia.

Editor of the New York Journal: Your editorial, "More Captains Wanted on Columbia," has evidently been written in ignorance of the real state of affairs on board the ship defender. There is talent enough on board—too much, perhaps.

"Too many cooks spoil the broth," a multitude of captains may easily lose a yacht race. There is Ollie Iselin, for instance, who must indorse each move before the skipper dare think of trying it, and who considers himself facile princeps of American yachtsmen, amateur or professional.

There is Butler Duncan, Annapolis graduate, second to none in yachting strategy and tactics, so he thinks.

There is Nat Herreshoff, the designer of Columbia, who really knows more about sailing a yacht than Iselin and Duncan together, and last, but not least, is Charlie Barr, who steers Columbia, who, notwithstanding he is a Britisher, is a first-class yachting skipper.

Now, this galaxy surely equals the talent on Shamrock.

Barr is as good as Hogarth, Herreshoff surely offsets Wringe, and if you dare to say that Iselin and Duncan do not balance Parker, the amateur yachtsmen of the New York Yacht Club will never forgive you.

### A Grateful Volunteer.

Editor of the New York Journal: Being one of the boys of the Forty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, and also a veteran of the late Spanish War, I would like to have you publish a few facts concerning the difference of treatment which we are receiving here from what we received in the other campaign.

The difference is really so wonderful that we do not know how to account for it. Our Colonel, John H. Bacon, we thank for quite a great deal of it, as we have noticed that he is always doing something for our good. He does not send some one else to see that what he has ordered to be done is done, but he goes himself and sees that it is all right, and if it is not, he stays there until it is done.

The food we get is of the best, and we get plenty of it. We even have different kinds of dried fruits. You can imagine yourself what a difference that is from hardtack. We all appreciate the difference in our treatment, and as we have no other way of expressing about it than through your paper, we thought you would condescend to make known our thanks to the War Department. The only thing we are impatient about is the delay in sending us all we are entitled to go to Manila and show the people what a new regiment can do.

SERGEANT R. M. D., Company M, Fort Niagara, N. Y., October 6.

### A Plea for the Ash Cart Horses.

Editor of the New York Journal: Now that the city is in a generous mood, will not some properly qualified official see that the city's humble servants, the garbage, paper and ash cart horses, have something to eat?

Judging from their appearance they are subsisting upon the memory of scant rations of the long ago. They would doubtless be glad to fill themselves with the good green corn husks forming a part of their food during the season, but are evidently denied that luxury.

They have had extra heavy loads of late; and, at all times, it is difficult enough to perform their requisite work, with no flesh between their skin and bones. When two horses become unable to stand alone they are sometimes harnessed together to a large cart, but that does not seem sufficient to keep them up and going.

C. M. A. W.

### The Journal Thanked for Defending Schley.

Editor of the New York Journal: As a loyal Marylander and a profound admirer of Rear Admiral Schley, I wish to express my thanks to you, both as a native of Maryland and as a Democrat, for your courageous vindication of Maryland's greatest man. JNO. C. WILLIAMS, No. 500 Church street, Norfolk, Va.

# MRS. INGERSOLL CASES DIVORCE A MORTAL CASE OF PRIVILEGE.

Widow of the Famous Agnostic Says the Attitude of Bishop Potter, Dr. Dix and Other Churchmen Is "Cruel, Thoughtless, Merciless and Almost Inconceivable When We Consider They Are Posing as Leaders of Enlightened Society."

By Mary C. Francis.

THE decided stand taken by women in the discussion of divorce and remarriage in opposition to the published opinions of Bishop Potter, the Rev. Dr. Morgan Dix and other prominent church dignitaries was indicated in the interviews which appeared in this column yesterday. I saw and talked yesterday with many women who are prominently before the public in the field of letters and art and as champions of the cause of their sex. The unanimity with which they disagreed with the views of the famous opponents of divorce surprised me.

One of the most decided stands taken in favor of more liberal divorce laws is the declaration of Mrs. Robert G. Ingersoll. When seen yesterday she readily consented to let the Journal readers know just how she viewed the discussion and the matter of divorce in general. She said:

MRS. ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

"Yes; I have read the views of Bishop Potter upon the subjects of marriage and divorce, and have noted the almost universal support which has been accorded him by the heads of the Episcopal Church. To me the attitude of these men is cruel, thoughtless, merciless, almost inconceivable when we consider that they are posing as good, honest, learned gentlemen and as leaders of enlightened society."

"If they are sincere and thoughtful men, if they have either love or respect for women, if they know of the hopes, the aspirations, the humiliations and the sufferings of the opposite sex, I can conceive of no excuse for or sense in their attitude toward women."

"They may mean well, they may not desire to be selfish, but, nevertheless, they are striving to deprive women of her only escape from a life of misery, humiliation and despair; to rob her of her independence and self-respect, without which she is nothing but a poor, pitiful slave, a social football for the sport of men."

"Divorce is the greatest legal concession ever made to woman. The privilege of divorce, of legal separation, is as sacred, as important to the welfare of society as the privileges of marriage, of the union of two souls."

"The indissolubility of marriage is a dogma which, like many other harmful ones, has come down to us from the superstitions of the Christian theology. That unfortunate and illogical sentence, 'Whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder,' has made the lives of countless millions one long agony of despair."

"Why should the Church, either directly or through its influence on legislation, try to prevent man or woman from correcting an error, the continuance of which would render life a failure?"

"According to Bishop Potter and his ecclesiastical supporters, it is a question whether even the innocent party to a divorce should not be made to suffer as well as the guilty, and be forever deprived of the privilege of remarriage. Why? Is marriage a crime? Is there something wrong in wedlock that it should not be indulged in a second time?"

"To a refined and sensitive woman could any state of existence have greater tendency to render her reckless, if not desperate? Is not the marriage state where love and respect have ceased to exist a dangerous one? And if a sick and discouraged soul eventually falls, what is to be her fate? Would it not be charitable to permit her to form another alliance where life would be tolerable and temptation less?"

"In conclusion I can only repeat the sentiments of Mrs. Ingersoll: To the husband, if it can be proven that the conduct of the wife has been flagrantly, outrageously bad, I would grant a divorce. To the woman I would give a divorce simply for the sake of her life, and because only through love and consideration, but because only through love can children be born who will be a credit to posterity."

Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton needs no introduction. She is unquestionably the strongest intellectual leader the great woman's movement ever had, and she has measured arguments with the opponents of her liberal views more than once. The discussion of 1890, in which she took a leading part, will be readily recalled. Robert Dale Owen had introduced into the Indiana Legislature a bill providing for more liberal divorce laws. Horace Greeley took up and bitterly opposed it. The argument waxed hot, and Mrs. Stanton took up her pen.

Greeley had said that women had no cause to ask for more liberality, as the laws were equal for men and women.

"From Coke down to Kent," she wrote, "who can cite one clause where woman has the advantage? Such laws transcend the limits of human legislation and outrage the holiest affections of the race."

"I have been inclined to sympathize to some extent with the Boers, but am much impressed by your clear and powerful leader. I wish you would give us another, covering the facts, in reply to the following:

1. Just how does it happen that England has the right to compel the Boers to change their nationality laws, any more than she would have to interfere with ours if they were displeasing to British immigrants?

2. What are the total demands made upon the Boers?

3. How much of the total demand have the Boers already agreed to allow?

4. Under what have they accepted nearly all?

5. What are the present points of disagreement, and finally, what does England now demand and the Dutch refuse? Respectfully,

H. M. CROSS.

No. 19 Barclay street, New York City.

### A Slap at Bourke Cockran.

Editor of the New York Journal: I would like to address through the columns of your paper a few words to some of the sympathetic but rather foolish people of this city who are holding indignation meetings against England's actions in the Boer matter. Who are they that are criticizing the only nation of all European powers that stood by America not long ago? Is it patriotic Irishmen—Americans who love this country and are willing to fight for it? No! On the contrary, it is the class who have spent their lives shouting "Ireland must be free!" It is turncoats like W. Bourke Cockran, who, having received honors at the hands of the Democratic party all his life, showed his gratitude by stamping Ohio for McKinley two years ago. It is disturbers like him, who are never satisfied with anything, that are trying to arouse this maudlin sympathy for a few renegade Boers who want the whole earth for themselves. It is my earnest wish as a patriotic American that England will wipe them off the map.

W. E. DAVIES.

No. 816 East One Hundred and Thirty-fifth street.

her nature. The laws on divorce are even more unequal than those on marriage. The advantage seems to be all on one side and the penalties on the other."

"I remember," said Mrs. Stanton to the Journal, "that it was about this time I was deluged with letters asking me to describe home life as it would be when men changed their wives every Christmas. I was astonished at the storm of denunciation that broke upon my head, caused chiefly by my address before the Legislature while Mr. Owens' bill was pending."

"But the experience of my entire life in the public arena has not yet taught me to fear public opinion, and I stand by what I said forty-odd years ago. My attitude on this subject is very well known, and I have written and published so much that it seems to me that at this date I cannot add anything to what I have already said time and time again."

"I see no evidence in this recent agitation that any of the ecclesiastical mentioned have thought sufficiently on the subject to prepare a well-digested code or a comprehensive amendment to the Constitution. In a discussion in the Arena in 1894 I wrote:

"Let us bear in mind that the widest possible divorce laws could not make divorce obligatory on any one, while a restricted law, on the contrary, would compel many, marrying, perhaps, under more liberal laws, to remain in uncongenial relations."

"Having decided that companionship and consolations parenthood are the only true grounds for marriage, if the relation brings out the worst characteristics of the parties, is not the very rational state of the union wanting and the marriage practically annulled? It is to the best interests of the State to see all such pernicious unions legally dissolved."

"The question of divorce, like marriage, should be settled as to its most sacred relation by the parties themselves, neither the Church nor the State having any right to meddle therein. If divorce were made respectable and recognized by society as a duty as well as a right, reasonable men and women could arrange all the preliminaries, including the division of property and the guardianship of children, quite as satisfactorily as could be done by the courts."

"Making the proceedings public, prying into the personal affairs of unhappy men and women, regarding the step as quasi criminal, punishing the guilty party in the suit, all these will not strengthen frail human nature, will not insure happy homes, will not purge society of its evils."

"No, the enemy of the State is not liberal divorce laws, but the unhealthy atmosphere that exists in the home itself. A legislative act cannot make a unit of a divided family."

### Mrs. Emma Beckwith.

Mrs. Emma Beckwith, who has long been known in connection with Sorosis, the Liberal League, suffrage work and many woman's movements, had already had her attention called to the utterances of Bishop Potter and Dr. Morgan Dix, and expressed her sentiments without hesitation.

"This whole subject of divorce and remarriage," she said, "is one which must soon be taken up and handled 'without gloves,' as the clergy are so fond of saying, but on a broader basis and with more common sense than has thus far been granted by their narrow and restricted views as stated in the public prints."

"I consider such extreme measures as are advocated by Bishop Potter and Dr. Dix absolutely dangerous to society. No man and woman should live together after they cease to love one another."

"Instead of regarding divorce as a destroyer of public morality and a rock on which the sanctity of the home is wrecked, I believe that, with judicious restrictions, it should be legally and morally as free as marriage itself, and further that no social odium should attach to divorcees except in those open and flagrant cases which violate every canon, both human and divine, and for which there is simply no remedy so long as human nature is human nature."

"In common with many other women who have watched this recent discussion in the public prints with indignant interest, I have noted the injustice and the one-sided view taken by most of the clergy, and the stand assumed by the majority to my mind lacks the element of common sense, the only basis on which this question can ever be satisfactorily adjusted."

"They take no account of the women who, for different reasons, have had their love for their husbands killed, yet who, fearing public opinion, live on under the same roof, literally a wife in name only, keeping up appearances before the world, yet more widely separated from the man whose name they bear than they could be by death."

"To live such a life as this sinks a woman instantly to an infinite depth of infamy and degradation, from which the Church and State should

hasten to release her. "When, on the contrary, ecclesiastical authority, of which the masses yet stand in dread, would force her matrimonial chains still closer and make a lifeless union indissoluble, it simply stamps with the sanction of the Church a crime of the most repulsive nature."

"I consider the utterances of the late Colonel Ingersoll on the subject of marriage and divorce as worthy of much more consideration than those of Bishop Potter and the clergy who support him, and I believe with him that more freedom instead of more stringency should be granted. The present condition of things I regard as largely the fault of women, who have permitted themselves to be ruled by a slavish fear of public opinion, of social ostracism, of the Church and by phantoms of that sex cowardice which will forever enslave women until they rise above it."

"Women themselves should fearlessly take this matter up and demand their rights and make a common cause. As to the question of the remarriage of the divorced person, it follows as a matter of course that if the law places a bar in the way of a legal union there is but one alternative left."

"No one can be found who believes more firmly than I in the sanctity of the home and the conservation of the standard of morality which must continue to make us a nation to be regarded as a model, but despite this it is my unalterable conviction that the matter of individual choice in the making or unmaking of ties which mean heaven or hell here below must not be restricted or interfered with beyond the bounds of reason by either the Church or the State. I am happy to be one woman to say a good word for my sex."

Miss Edith J. Griswold.

Miss Edith J. Griswold, the patent lawyer, when found in her office in the St. Paul Building, said: "Several days ago I noticed the utterances of Bishop Potter and Dr. Dix, and when they were rapidly followed by a chorus of approval from the clergy all over the country I saw that the inevitable game of follow my leader was on and paid no more attention to it, for, of course, nothing else could be expected."

"The attitude taken by the reverend gentlemen collectively is radically unjust, narrow minded and I had almost said illegal, for in denying the right of the individual to make such a choice as he sees fit for a matrimonial partner—a partnership which the law considers a civil contract—they would take away one of the rights recognized in our Constitution."

"I believe that the alleged evils accruing from divorce and remarriage are greatly overestimated, while the evils resulting from a continuance of the marriage bond when either one or both of the parties desires its dissolution are underestimated. It is magnified at the expense of the other."

"Where an unhappy marriage is continued, the woman is forced to live with the greater suffering from it, but since men make and enforce the laws she is compelled to submit to them."

"For my part, I honor a woman who has the moral courage to demand the legal severance of bonds that have become odious to her, and if she can enter into other and happier relations she should be perfectly free to do so."

"I fall to see also why the mere utterances of the clergy on the subject should carry so much weight. The State primarily confers the authority to contract marriages, and all the Church can do is to ratify it. It is an undue assumption of jurisdiction, and is merely a survival of the traditions of the Church in